REMARKS

This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated May 12, 2009, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-33 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Rejection of claims 1-4, 7-12, 16-20, 22-28, 32 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 7-12, 16-20, 22-28, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert (US Pub No. 2004/0044779) in view of Safadi (US Pub. No. 2003/0126086) in view of Russ et al (US Patent No. 6,748,080) and in view of Hans et al (US Patent No. 7,200,575). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

> a server, wherein if the server receives multimedia contents from one of a plurality of DRM server groups having a unique DRM solution respectively, the server performs communication relating to services with the corresponding DRM server group according to the DRM solution of the received multimedia contents, converts the received multimedia contents into multimedia contents having a format suitable for at least one client of the intranet and transmits the converted multimedia contents to the client.

Lambert discloses a server for DRM which would provide a user with a copy of rights to content. See paragraph [0021]. The rights storage is distributed between a client and server. See paragraph [0111]. If a consumer attempts to access a DRM-encrypted content file that is subject to rights management restriction, the DRM client checks its local client-side rights caches for prior authorization to access the DRM-encrypted content file. See paragraph [0116]. Therefore,

Lambert is merely directed to consumer's access rights. Lambert does not teach or suggest a DRM server group having a unique DRM solution as recited in claim 1.

On page 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner states "[t]his cooperation can involve communication between the DRM client and the DRM server and this communication may involve the exchange of rights encoded in electronic form." However, Lambert never teaches or suggests that a "server performs communication relating to services with the corresponding DRM server group according to the DRM solution of the received multimedia contents."

Lambert discloses a DRM bureau service which stores rights on the bureau service's DRM servers and proactively serves rights in response to consumer demand. Further, Lambert discloses content publishers use their bureau accounts to DRM-encrypt their digital content in such a way that consumers must obtain rights from the bureau before they can access the DRM-encrypted content, and content consumers use their bureau accounts to purchase the rights to access the DRM-encrypted content (from one or more publishers) and can optionally store their rights on the bureau's DRM servers. See paragraphs [0132] and [0136] of Lambert. Therefore, the bureau service acts as a centralized repository for the digital rights.

However, Lambert does not teach or suggest "a server, wherein if the server receives multimedia contents from one of a plurality of DRM server groups having a unique DRM solution respectively, the server performs communication relating to services with the corresponding DRM server group according to the DRM solution of the received multimedia contents," as recited in claim 1. Lambert merely discloses the bureau service which acts as a centralized repository for the digital rights.

Also, Safadi, Russ and Hans do not cure the deficiencies of Lambert.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. To the extent claims 8, 17 and 24 recite similar elements, claims 8, 17 and 24 should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

II. Rejection of claims 5, 13-15, 21, 29-31, and 33 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 13-15, 21, 29-31, and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert in view of Safadi, in view of Russ, in view of Hans and further in view of Fransdonk (US Patent No. 7,228,427). Claims 5, 13-15, 21, 29-31, and 33 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 8, 17 and 24 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Fransdonk does not cure the deficiencies of Lambert, Safadi and Russ.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 10, 2009